DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 178 430 SO 012 094

AUTHOR Dworkin, Rosalind J.
TITLE Differential Processes in Acculturation: The Case of Asiatic Indians in the United States.
INSTITUTION Houston Univ., Tex.
PUB DATE 31 Aug 79
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (Boston, MA, August 27-31, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Acculturation; Cultural Background; Cultural Factors; *Cultural Traits; Employment; Ethnic Groups; *Females; *Indians; *Males; Sex Differences; *Social Influences

ABSTRACT

The study shows that acculturation is a process which varies not only from ethnic group to ethnic group, but also within an ethnic group. One hundred and thirty six Asian Indians, ranging from 15 to 64 years of age, living in Houston, Texas, comprise the sample. The six cultural traits selected as representative of intrinsic and extrinsic Indian traits which must be modified during the acculturation process are religion, dress, marriage type (arranged or love), the use of tobacco, the consumption of alcohol, and the eating of beef. The male pattern reveals that the first cultural trait westernized is that of dress, followed by attitude toward marriage type and change in dietary habit. The traits which tend to acculturate much later are consumption of alcohol, use of tobacco, and the ultimate step, religion. The female pattern indicates that attitude toward marriage type, eating of beef, and dress are the first three traits to change. It appears that dress is more intrinsic in women than men; it represents their place in the life cycle and their modesty, morality, and religion. The use of tobacco, an extreme for Asian Indian women, rates last on the scale. Subsequent tests reveal that both gender and employment shape the patterns of acculturation and that pressures emanate from both the host and ethnic cultures. Also, acculturation patterns are affected by their intrinsic nature, visibility, and resource availability in the host culture. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED178430

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Differential Processes in Acculturation:

The Case of Asiatic Indians in the United States

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Rosalind J. Dworkin
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Rosalind J. Dworkin,

University of Houston

*The author wishes to thank Dr. P. R. J. Ganadharam, Mrs. P. Sakunthala Ganadharam, and A. G. Dworkin for their cooperation during the field work; and also J. S. Chafetz, A. Colson, and H. R. Ebaugh for their thoughtful reading of the manuscript.

SP 012 094

"Not for reproduction, quotation, or any other use without permission of the author, except for press use after (August 31, 1979)."

Differential Process in Acculturation: The Case of Asiatic Indians in the United States

by Rosalind J. Dworkin
University of Houston

Abstract

Acculturation of a migrant population is a process the pattern of which will vary by subgroup as a function of the interaction between the host society and each subgroup. A multi-method study of Asiatic Indians in the United States was conducted. Using Guttman Scale analysis on six cultural traits, different acculturation patterns emerged for gender subgroups and for employment subgroups. The acculturation patterns obtained were influenced by the intrinsicness, visibility, and resource availability of the cultural traits for each subgroup. Additionally, there was significant differences between males and females and between employed and unemployed persons in the degree of acculturation experienced.

Differential Processes in Acculturation: The Case of Asiatic Indians in the United States

The heritage of structural functional analysis in sociology has been one which emphasized the homogeneity of end products in the light of similar structural forces. Whether the ooncern was for societal development and modernization (see Metzger, 1971; Greeley, 1974; Meyer, 1975), ethnic stratification (see Turner and Singleton, 1978), or the assimilation of migrant populations (see Lyman, 1972; Watson, 1977), this functional paradigm subordinated the unique cultural and historical variables which focus the patterns and outcomes of interactions among the peoples concerned.

More specifically, Feldman and Moore (1969) and Hollander (1973) have argued that structural variables considered in the absence of these unique cultural and historical factors rarely predict accurately the process of societal change during industrialization and westernization. Particularly, distinct cultural norms, beliefs, and attitudes affect a people's receptivity to and interpretation of structural and organizational elements. Hence, different groups (or subgroups) experiencing similar structural pressures will interpret and react to these pressures in light of their different cultural orientations. Thus, the end result of structural changes will differ among diverse cultural groups.

Similarly, when a group (or subgroup) is undergoing structual changes due, not to the development of their society, but to the pressures of inter-group relations, those changes will

also reflect cultural considerations. In their recent work on ethnic oppression, Turner and Singleton (1978) have asserted that although structural variables are essential to a study of inter-group relations, they have been over-emphasized to the exclusion of cultural variables. This has been a major flaw in such work since no theory of inter-group relations can reflect reality without the incorporation of cultural differences, belief structures, etc. into the theoretical model.

In addition, one cannot study the assimilation of migrant populations without also considering the culture of both migrant and host societies. Of the many types of assimilation, Gordon (1964, 1978) posits that acculturation is the first to occur, and that it is sometimes the only form of assimilation a migrant group undergoes. As such, acculturation deserves far more attention from sociologists than it has recently received.

Although it is the one form of assimilation which requires no acceptance by the core society, acculturation does, nevertheles, require some form of interaction between the host society and the migrant group, even if this form involves only the mass media. The product of this acculturation process is not necessarily Anglo conformity or even pluralism. As Glazer and Moynahan (1963) have pointed out, acculturation more characteristically results in a hybrid reflecting the distinctiveness of the immigrant culture and the host's core culture. The immigrant group becomes neither a homogeneous mass undifferentiated from the host society or other immigrant groups, nor does it remain isomorphic with the population

from the immigrant's former society. Hence, when we speak of an acculturated Italian we are referring to a set of behaviors and values, and a process by which they were acquired, that are different from an acculturated Puerto Rican.

Thus the development of culture-specific measures of acculturation is required. Such measures must reflect characteristics of both the core culture into which the migrant is acculturating. These two points deal with the content of acculturation: which behaviors, beliefs, attitudes, etc. are being changed and/or modified, and which are being retained. However, there is a third consideration--that of process. Those characteristics (often ascribed) of both core and migrant cultures which may differentially affect the process of acculturation must be identified. Such characteristics as the nature of gender role assignment, racial distinctions, and age groupings may indeed determine a different process for each subgroup within the migrant population.

The logic behind this should be evident. Acculturation occurs through exposure and/or contact of two cultures. Each society has normative prescriptions for their various subgroups which govern who may be in contact with whom and in what way. For example, in nearly all cultures males are permitted interactions with different persons and under different conditions than are females. And because these interaction expectations are different, persons and under different conditions than are

females. And because these interaction expectations are different, exposure to the core American culture will be different, both in kind and in quantity, for the two sexes. Therefore, we would expect males and females to differ in the acculturating experience, both in so far as content and process is concerned.

Thus, it is the purpose of this paper to report on the content and the process of acculturation for a group entering the United States in increasing numbers--Asiatic Indians-- and to explore how that process varies by subgroups.

Asiatic Indians

Asiatic Indians who have immigrated to the United States are the selected group for this study of acculturation. There is a large body of literature on the Asiatic Indian in Britain (see Rex, 1973; Desai, 1963; Allen, 1971, and Mason, 1970). Unfortunately, this literature cannot appropriately be generalized to the United States for several reasons. Indians have immigrated to Britain in larger numbers and for a longer time; there is greater caste and class diversity; there are more often large, concentrated Indian communities, especially in London; and, of course, the historical relationship between India and Britain is far different than between India and the United States.

On the other hand, there is little written about Asiatic

Indians in the United States. At present, they represent a rather small group. Although the U. S. Census (1973) and the Indian embassy estimates differ, there appears to be no more than 100,000 Asiatic Indians currently residing in the United States. Estimates of the population in different localities differ dramatically. The Census (1972) claims there are just over 300 Indians living at the study site, while membership lists of local Indian associations list over 600 members. Even though exact numbers are not available, all sources, both governmental and informal, agree that this is a group whose size is increasing, especially since the 1975 changes in the U.S. Immigration laws. This increase in number will no doubt eventually make this group more visible to others in this country, both to minority groups and the white majority.

Indians in the United States constitute an identifiable group differing by physical appearance, by accent, and by dress (especially the women). For most Americans, Indians are perceived to be racially divergent and often ambiguous. Various Indians have reported being defined into each of the racial categories currently in use in the United States (Lambert and Bressler, 1956). Some are defined as white (especially Aryans from northern India); others have told of being lumped together with Chinese and Japanese and called Oriental because "India ia an Asian nation." Still others have been defined as brown (with Chicanos) or black (especially Dravidians). Furthermore,

it is not unusual for one individual to be defined into two or more categories on different occasions. The British have circumvented this racial ambiguity by the use of the "coloured" classification (Rex, 1973, Watson, 1977).

In addition to this racial ambiguity, Indian culture, for all its internal complexity and diversity, is quite distinct from the core American culture. However, it is beyond the scope of this paper to describe Indian culture. For details, the reader is referred to one of the several books and articles on the subject (e.g., Tyler, 1973; Gupta, 1975; and Welty, 1976).

Asian Indians differ from many other immigrant groups who have come to this country in that even before immigration, most spoke English at least as a second or third language. They have also tended to come from high socioeconomic statuses (Anandakrishnan, 1975) and/or high caste positions. Heads of households as a group are well educated and have, or are in the process of obtaining, professional credentials.

Finally, this group is not entering the United States under emotionally charged political circumstances, as is the case with the Viet Namese and the Cubans, nor are they impelled by equally emotional social-humanitarian reasons as was the case of the Irish during the potato famine and the Jews during

the East European pogroms. While hardly comparable, the emergency measures of Indira Ghandi occurred after the increase of immigration had already well begun and they do not appear to have affected immigration signficantly. Immigration motivation appears mainly to be the desire for better jobs. Others come for educational opportunities even though American training may not be entirely appropriate upon return to India (Useem and Useem, 1955).

All these characteristics--relatively small numbers, cultural differences, high S. E. S., and low emotional circumstances--combine to make Asiatic Indians in this country a non-threatening group to the host society, and thus an excellent group in which to study the process of acculturation.

Methodology

This report is part of a larger, multi-method study of Asiatic Indians living in the city of Houston, Texas. The field work took nearly two years and included participant observation, conferences with personnel in the Indian embassy in Washington, D.C., some informant interviewing, and 136 in-depth interviews. The participant observation which began the study continued through the other phases and included attendance at major cultural festivities and pujas, meetings of local Indian cultural associations, as well as visits to private homes. All this served as an introduction to Indian culture as practiced in Houston and helped in framing research

questions. The informant interviewing phase which followed guided the construction of the interview schedule used in the final phase of the research.

The interviews were conducted in private homes using a reputational-snowball sample with initial names supplied by informants and their friends. A sample of this sort has its obvious biases as does any non-random sample. However, the available alternative produced its own problems. Membership lists of Indian cultural associations could have provided the only basis on which to randomly draw a sample. However, this method would have totally excluded those Indians who did not belong to any such organization; these would have been primarily women, and those individuals most thoroughly acculturated. Thus, it was the research decision to compromise randomness in the desire to obtain diversity.

Sample Description

The final interview sample is comprised of 136 individuals ranging from 15 to 64 years of age with a mean age of 34.6. Seventy-four percent are between the ages of 20 and 40 years. This compares favorably with the estimated age distribution for Indian immigrants in the United States (Anadakrishnan, 1975). Sixty-one percent of the subjects are male, whereas nation-wide approximately 51% are male (Anandakrishnan, 1975). This is no doubt due to the higher proportion of young, unmarried males enrolled in the universi-

ties and medical schools in the study area.

The sample is concentrated in the higher socioeconomic statuses. Of those employed, all are in white collar occupations; slightly over 64% are professionals. Nearly 20% reported being housewives and almost 12% are students. The median household income is $18,000. Educational achievement is also high. Eighty-seven percent have the equivalent of a college education or more. Indeed, 28% have highest professional degrees (Ph.D.s and MDs).

A majority (66%) immigrated from Southern India. Most (86%) are Hindu. Of these, 52% claim Brahmin caste origins; 19.4% Viasys; 15.7% Kshatriya; and 13% Sudras. That is, 87% are twice-born. (Caste, of course, is not appropriate for non-Hindus; Allen, 1971). Hence, our subjects are generally of not only high S. E. S in this country, but of high status-honor in their native India.

In terms of citizenship and visa status, 14% are naturalized U. S. citizens; 75% are permanent residence immigrants; 10% are here on a student visa; and two subjects have unspecified visas. Finally, half of the sample arrived in the United States since 1969, the earliest arrival immigrating in 1949. The latest arrival was six months prior to being interviewed.

Selection of Acculturation Traits

Gordon (1978) posits two types of cultural traits which

must be considered when studying the behavioral content of acculturation. The first type is composed of "intrinsic cultural traits:" i.e., those behaviors and belief systems which are at the core of the ethnic group's cultural heritage. The other is the "extrinsic trait" type which includes those cultural components that are more tangential to the core. This is not to say necessarily that one is more easily surrendered in the process of acculturation than is the other. Nevertheless, a scale of acculturation should include in it references to both types of cultural traits. Obviously, since there are too many traits in any ethnic culture for an exhaustive scale, a measure of acculturation, while including both intrinsic and extrinsic traits, must be selective.

Selection of appropriate cultural traits to serve as variables in an acculturation scale was done through the use of the informant interviews. Traits were selected which fulfilled two requirements. First, they represented behaviors/beliefs which to both informants and researcher indicated noticeable differences between the ethnic and the host culture. That is, differences between Asiatic Indian culture and the core American culture were apparent along these variables. Secondly, they were traits that informants reported were crucial to them in the process of "Americanization." Thus, the selection of traits had a definite subjective element by selecting those modal forms of the host culture which informants

believed were most salient in the acculturation of Asiatic Indians.

Initially, seven cultural traits were selected as being representative of those intrinsic and extrinsic Indian traits which must be modified during the acculturation process. One trait--language--was ultimately eliminated from analysis when it became apparent that there was no variability on this issue. All subjects (save one) had spoken English in India at least as a second or third language, and all subjects (save one) used English regularly now (though not necessarily to the exclusion of other languages).

The other six items remained. They included: religion; dress; marriage type; the use of tobacco; the consumption of alcohol; and the eating of beef. Each of these items refer to the present reported behavior of subjects, except for marriage type. For this trait, subjects stated the type of marriage they preferred for their children--a love or an arranged marriage. This format was favored over asking subjects about their own marriages. Although according to Welty (1976), love marriages are rare in India, many subjects retrospectively redefine their marriages. Statements such as, "We were betrothed before we were ten by our parents' agreement, but we really have a love marriage," are not uncommon. Thus, a more reliable comparison of subjects' current attitudes with American core attitudes about marriage can be made by using stated preferences for the children.

Table 1 summarizes the distribution of subjects along these six cultural traits. Two observations can be made from this table.

Table 1

Cultural Traits Exhibited by Asiatic Indians

(in percents)

Traits	While in India	Since Immigrating to the United States
Religion	n = 128	n = 125
Hindu and Other Eastern Religions	94%	91%
Christian	6%	9%
Marriage Type	n = 106	n = 109
Arranged	65%	26%
Love	22%	13%
Combination	13%	61%
Wear Western Dress	n = 126	n = 126
Never	26%	6%
Sometimes	14%	18%
Most of the Time	42%	45%
Always	17%	30%
Use Tobacco	n = 116	n = 115
Never	75%	75%
Seldom	9%	10%
Sometimes	9%	8%
Frequently	1%	1%
Always	5%	6%
Consume Alcohol	n = 121	n = 117
Never	67%	38%
Seldom	21%	36%
Sometimes	8%	17%
Frequently	2%	4%
Always	1%	4%
Eat Beef	n = 118	n = 121
Never	70%	35%
Seldom	16%	15%
Sometimes	2%	17%
Frequently	9%	25%
Always	3%	9%

First, there is indeed sufficient variation to allow for scaling procedures. Secondly, for each trait, some subjects had been acculturated to western modes even before leaving India. Of interest is not where one began the acculturation process, but the pattern of the process regardless of the geographic location of the individual at the time. India, itself, due to past British influence, and the current industrialization and urbanization is becoming more "Westernized" at least in the major urban centers. Although this westernization may retain a distinct Indian flavor, it nevertheless represents a shift from traditionalism to forms reminiscent of western industrialized nations, including the United States. Immigrants from this changing India might also reflect these changes.

The Process of Indian Acculturation

The six chosen cultural traits were subjected to Guttman Scale Analysis in order to ascertain if there was a systematic pattern to the process of acculturation of Asiatic Indians. Initially there was an attempt to develop one Guttman Scale which would describe that process for all subjects in the sample. This was attempted without success. No matter what cutting points, or combination of cutting points, were used, no unidimensional scale emerged which passed the minimal criteria of a .90 Coefficient of Reproducibility and a .60 Coefficient of Scalability. Dropping items did not help appreciably.

In view of the previous discussion, this finding was not unanticipated. Since acculturation depends upon cultural contact, either actively through personal interaction, or passively through exposure to the mass media, acculturation will proceed differently for subgroups which differentially experience the core host culture. Hence, we ought not expect all Indians to acculturate along the same pattern.

Early in the field work, it became apparent that two subgroups which are fundamental in the structure of the Indian community are based upon gender. There is a sharp division between the male sphere and the female sphere of experience and expertise, just as there is in most societies. Men and women segregate themselves at social gatherings; clear distinctions are made between men's work and women's work; nearly all the males were either employed or are students--activities which take them outside the home and potentially into the presence of Americans; whereas housewives often talked of learning about American culture by watching daytime television rather than through direct personal contact with Americans; the males tended to be gregarious and aggressive in their interactions with others, including Americans; while the women seemed to cultivate a "shyness" around non-Indians that has inhibited both the depth and the duration of most cross-ethnic interaction. (This shyness diminished greatly ofter the researcher adopted traditional Indian dress and

hair style.) These different modes of behavior suggest that perhaps men and women are indeed experiencing American culture in different ways and thus would exhibit different patterns of acculturation; i.e., different Guttman Scale configurations.

Further observation supported this hypothesis. For example, very few males were ever observed (by either myself or a male colleague) wearing traditional clothing. One such occasion occurred during an unannounced visit to an informant's home; and other instance occurred during religious ritual. On the other hand, women who had spent an equal length of time in this country as the men routinely wore saris; some wore saris exclusively--others wore saris when at home or in the presence of other Indians and wore Western clothing while working or attending classes.

It was appropriate then that the cultural trait data were submitted to Guttman Scaling procedures separately for males and females. As expected two different scales did emerge, based upon identical cutting points but having different pattern configurations. The former characteristic--identical cutting points--is vital in order to make comparisons across groups on the degree of acculturation acquired. The cutting points used do not represent merely pragmatic decisions made to enhance scalability. They were arrived at through consideration of the substantive content of responses. In fact, unidimensional scales were generated using two dif-

ferent sets of cutting points, both of which achieved minimal Coefficients of Reproducibility, but differing in the configuration. One set of scales was eliminated because the patterns obtained were more an artifact of the cutting points selected, and were incongruous with both the field observations and the interview data. The remaining set of scales both met the criteria for a scalability and substantively reflected a reality congruent with the reality observed by the researchers and reported by informants.

The cutting points ultimately used are as follow.: self identification as a Christian (any denomination) constituted an acculturated response on the religion item (there were no Jews); those who called themselves either Hindu, Moslim, Jain, or Sikh were traditional on the religion item. Preferring an arranged marriage for one's children was coded as acculturated; endorsing a love marriage was traditional. Wearing Western dress always or most of the time was considered acculturated, but never or infrequently wearing Western dress was considered traditional. The eating of beef, use of tobacco, and the consumption of alcohol all had the same cutting points: using products sometimes, much of the time, or all the time was coded each as acculturared; and never using the product or use on very rare occasions was considered traditional. In other words, in order to pass as acculturated on any one item, the subject must demonstrate more than an

occasional cultural compromise.

The Male Pattern

The Guttman Scale generated from the male subsample achieved a Coefficient of Reproducibility of .94 and a Coefficient of Scalability of .66, well above the .90 and .60 minimum criteria, respectively. The pattern configuration emerged in the following order:

1. The cultural trait which is first westernized for males is that of dress. In fact, most males wear western dress exclusively, or nearly so even while still living in India. Dress is an immediately identifiable trait to even a casual observer, and it would be expected that males in white collar and/or professional occupations would meet with considerable pressure to conform to that dress expected in most urban industrial centers, be they in India or in the United States.

2. The second trait to undergo cultural change is attitude toward marriage type. While one's desires for either a love or an arranged marriage for his children is not highly visible, it is central to the maintainance of the traditional Indian family, caste, and language. However, the norm of romantic love is so pervasive in American society that contact, both active and passive with it cannot be easily avoided.

3. The third trait to emerge in the acculturation process is that of dietary habit--specifically the eating of beef

and beef products. Although tied intimately to religious beliefs, abstinence from beef is a social handicap in this country. Dining in restaurants with non-Indian colleagues becomes an embarrassing situation, fraught with uncertainties, (e.g., are the French Fries cooked in vegetable shortening or animal lard?) Moreover, a vegetarian diet is not cheap, nor do American markets offer the diversity of vegetable products many Indians are used to. Thus, compromises are made; a vegetarian diet may be desired for the home, but on the outside, varying amounts of eggs, fish, chicken, and even beef is eaten.

4. The fourth cultural trait in the male pattern is the consumption of alcohol. The Indian prohibition against alcohol is more total than that against meat; different castes are governed by different dietary norms, but alcohol is universally discouraged both in the religious and in the political sectors. In addition to the strength of the Indian prescription, the American prescription is weaker for alcohol than it is for beef. Individuals can avoid drinking without being labelled as seriously deviant. Hence, this item of cultural adaptation emerges later than does eating beef.

5. Much the same can be said concerning the use of tobacco which is the fifth item on the Guttman Scale. However, the American prescription for tobacco is steadily becoming weaker for not only immigrant groups, but for the

native population as well. Hence, smoking is considered more of a non-Indian thing to do than it is seen as an American thing to do.

6. Finally, the last trait to emerge in the Guttman Scale is that of religion. Religion is a deeply intrinsic trait, one which many Indians place at the heart of Indian identity. And, judging from its placement in the scale, is an ultimate step in acculturating.

To summarize, then, the pattern configuration for males is: dress, marriage type, beef, alcohol, tobacco, and religion.

The Female Pattern

The female subsample also displayed a systematic ordering of the acculturation variables through Guttman Scale Analysis. Using the cutting points established in the previous scale, the Coefficient of Reproducibility for the female subsample reached .90, while the Coefficient of Scalability is equal to .60. Upon comparison with the male scale statistics, the female scale has somewhat more error, but is nevertheless within the acceptable bounds. Most noteworthy are the differences in the scale ordering. The women's pattern configuration in ascending order of difficulty is: marriage type, eating beef, western dress, consuming alcohol, western religion, and using tobacco.

The pattern differences focus upon two variables. First,

using tobacco moved from fifth place on the men's scale to sixth on the women's. For females, the use of tobacco is an extreme item, and this no doubt caused its reversal with religion. However, the item was retained to maintain comparability with the scale for men. Of greater theoretical interest is the change in the dress variable. In the male pattern, dress was the first trait to change, followed by marriage type and then beef. In the female pattern, however, dress comes into the scale in the third position with marriage type coming first, and beef second. Dress is a cultural trait more intrinsic to women than to men. Dress is more than fashion for the Indian women; it also represents place in the life cycle (girl children do not wear saris) as well as morality, modesty (women have been observed swimming in pools fully clothed) and religion. Furthermore, women are not as often in the labor force as are men, and thus are spared the most direct pressures to conform to western dress codes.

Cross Gender Comparisons

Because identical cutting points were used for the male and female scales, both qualitive and quantitative comparisons can be made across scales. A qualitative comparison of the respective patterns has already been made in the previous section. An additional point must be made, however. The

Patterns obtained do not indicate specific times when items emerge, only the order. Hence, although the eating of beef emerges second for women and third for man, we must not conclude from this that females actually begin to eat beef chronologically sooner than do males. Rather, a husband and wife probably begin eating beef at about the same time. In addition, cross tabulating the two variable (sex by eating beef) yields no significant difference (χ^2= 8.938; d.f. - 4; p >.05) between men and women in their beef eating habits.

Quantitative comparisons may also be made between males and females in so far as the extent of acculturation is concerned. Guttman Scale scores were computed by the simple summation of items passed, as recommended by Nie et. al., (1975). The highest score possible was 6; the lowest was 0. Among the 82 males for which there were sufficient data the scores ranged from 1 to 6 with an arithmetic mean of 2.9 and a standard deviation of 1.3. Females (n=49) ranged from 0 to 5 with a maan of 1.73 and a standard deviation of 1.44. After confirming the hypothesis of equal variances, a t-test was computed (see Table 2). The male mean score was found to be significantly higher than the female mean score ($p < .05$).

Table 2

t-Test for the Difference Between

Male and Female Acculturation Scores

	n	$\bar{X}$	s
Males	82	2.91	1.30
Females	49	1.73	1.44

t = 4.81 d.f. = 129 $p < .05$

The Contribution of Employment

It has been suggested previously in this paper that the differences in the male and female patterns may be due in part to differences in employment status. Being in the world of work exposes the immigrant to specific direct contact with the core culture with which the individual at home may come into contact only indirectly through the mass media or through the interpretations of others in the household.

Indeed, Inkeles and Rossi (1956) have hypothesized that cross-nationally, industrialization and urbanization produce certain cultural regularities in occupational behavior. If such is the case, then employed Indians in Houston should be more acculturated than Houston Indians who are not employed and remain at home. This would be anticipated for two reasons: First, the employed subsample, which also

includes students, had similar statuses while still in India and thus arrived in the United States already somewhat westernized. For example, Lambert and Bressler (1956) observed that Indian students do not have great problems adjusting to the academic aspects of American universities because of their similarity to Indian institutions. Secondly, once here, it is the employed who have daily concentrated exposure to American culture in the work place. The unemployed are almost exclusively housewives, and were so in India. Thus, they had less exposure to industrial urban culture either in India or in the United States.

In the current sample, 76% of the subjects were employed at the time of interviewing. This includes 15 students. Although students are not employed (i.e., they are neither in the labor force nor are they earning a salary) it is appropriate to consider them with the employed in this context, because the student role takes them outside the home and into direct contact with the host society. Of this employed subsample, 78% are male and the remaining 22% are female. Of the unemployed persons, 94% are female and 4% are male. Because of the large proportion of employed females, we are not merely making another male-female comparison under a different label.

Using the acculturation scores already described, a comparison between the mean scores of employed and unemployed subjects was made. Table 3 presents the results of the

t-test. From this table one can conclude that, as predicted, the mean acculturation score for employed subjects was

Table 3

t-Test for the Difference Between Employed and Unemployed Acculturation Scores

	n	$\bar{X}$	s
Employed	100	2.65	1.42
Unemployed	31	1.90	1.51

$t = 2.52$ d.f. = 129 $p < .05$

significantly greater than the mean acculturation score for the unemployed.

Pursuing the contribution of employment somewhat further, the argument could be made that the employed and unemployed may differ not only quantitatively in their degree of acculturation, but since these are subgroups that are exposed to different aspects of the core culture, they may differ from each other qualitatively as well. That is, like the gender subgroups, employed and unemployed subgroups may each exhibit acculturation patterns different from one another. To explore this possibility, a new set of Guttman Scale analyses was performed upon the sample. The cutting points previously used were retained, but scaling was performed separately for employed and un-

employed subjects.

The employed subsample generated a Guttman Scale with a Coefficient of Reproducibility of .91 and a Coefficient of Scalability of .57, the latter falling slightly below the desired minimum. The most noteworthy aspect of this scale is that the configuration is identiaal to the male pattern even though 22% of this subgroup are female.

The unemployed subsample generated an even stronger scale with a Coefficient of Reproducibility of .94 and a Coefficient of Scalability of .75. The configuration of this scale was nearly the same as the female pattern. Two items were reversed producing the following order: marriage preference, eating beef, dress, religion, consuming alcohol, and using tobacco. The reversed items--religion and alcohol--had identical percents passing and failing with such similar arrangements of errors that the generated order appears almost aribtrary in this instance.

With the employed subsample duplicating the male pattern, and the unemployed nearly duplicating the female pattern, it would appear that males and females differ in their pattern configuration because of their differential exposure to the core American culture as it is concentrated in the world of work.

As a final step, Guttman Scale analysis was performed separately on employed women and unemployed women. The

scale produced by unemployed women replicated precisely the pattern produced by all unemployed persons, but with slightly higher scaling coefficients. The employed women, however, produced a pattern which was mid-way between that produced by unemployed women and that produced by men. On the unemployed female scale, the two middle variables are dress, in third position and religion in fourth position. These variables occupy the extreme positions in the men's pattern: dress in first position and religion in sixth position. For employed women, dress emerges second; thus earlier than for unemployed women, but not quite as early as for men. Religion moves in the opposite direction to the fifth position, thus emerging later for employed women than for unemployed women, but not quite so late as for men. The patterns of the other four traits remain constant across all three groups, given the shifts of dress and religion. Although the scaling coefficients did not reach the minimum desired because of a decreased n, the shifts in the patterns do suggest that the acculturation process of employed women bears a resemblance both to other women and to men. The employed woman is less like the housewife in acculturation pattern, but is not fully male either. She retains characteristics of both and occupies an intermediate point.

Conclusion

This paper has demonstrated the necessity of conceptualizing acculturation as a process which will vary not only from ethnic group to ethnic group, but one which will also vary within any one ethnicity along subgroup classifications which differentiate types of exposure to the host culture. That males and females display different patterns substantiate this. However, sex alone does not account for all of the difference in the patterns. Rather, employment status presents its own effects. Thus, females who are employed have a pattern which is mid-way between that of female who are not employed and males. Neither employment status and gender, therefore, are sufficient conditions for the emergent acculturation pattern of the subgroups. Rather, both gender and employment help the shape the patterns of acculturation which emerged.

In the case of other migrant populations, other subgroups may differentiate the process to a greater or lesser extent. For example, Kitano (1969) has suggested that among the Japanese generational differences may be crucial to an understanding of that group's acculturation. Just as there is diversification within any specific group, there is also a diversification of acculturation patterns and experiences.

However, to argue for a diversification of pattern does not preclude the possibility of some generalizations

about those patterns. There are certain conclusions that can be drawn regarding the ease with which various cultural traits are westernized--some generalized explanations for the observed Guttman configurations. Acculturation involves the dynamics of pressures emanating from two sources. The host culture may exert pressures for change or acculturation, while the ethnic culture may exert pressures for traditionalism. These dual pressures will vary in intensity by cultural trait in accordance with several factors. The first of these is the extent to which the trait involved is intrinsic to both or either culture. The more intrinsic the trait, the greater will be the pressures toward conformity (be that involve change or stasis). For example, if religion is deeply intrinsic to a migrant culture, then it would be expected (all else being equal) to emerge later in the Guttman configuration than a trait which is not so intrinsic.

However, all else is seldom equal. There are other factors which influence the pressures toward acculturation. The pressures due to intrinsicness can be offset by the visibility of the cultural behavior. Visibility makes possible surveiliance and thus increased pressure becomes possible. Furthermore, a given trait may be more easily visible to the ethnic community than to the host society (or vice versa). For example, religious behavior is more

visible to the migrant community than it is to the host community. Hence, through surveillance there may be greater pressures for traditionalism than for acculturation and thus religion would emerge later than some other trait more visible to the host, such as language. So the more visible the behavior, the greater the pressure for conformity to cultural expectations (be they ethnic or host).

Finally, convenience and availability of the accouterments of the specific trait will influence the pressures toward acculturation. Cultural traits which require unavailable physical resources or personnel, or the practice of which becomes very inconvenient (or even sanctioned) will enter the acculturation process relatively early. Such is the case for diet among the Asiatic Indians.

In conclusion, the Guttman pattern configuration can be seen as the result of conflicting pressures from the host and ethnic cultures. These pressures are themselves a function of three factors--intrinsicness, visibility, and availability--which, when variously weighted by different subgroups, are entered into a calculus to produce distinct patterns of acculturation.

References

Allen, Sheila.
1971 New Minorities, Old Conflicts. New York: Random House.

Anandakrishnan, M.
1975 Quantatitive Significance of Indian Scientific Manpower in the U. S. A. Unpublished manuscript.

Desai, Rashmi
1963 Indian Immigrants in Britain. New York: Oxford University Press.

Feldman, Arnold S. and Wilbert E. Moore
1969 "Industrialization and Industrialism: Convergence and Differentiation" in William A. Faunce, ed., Comparative Perspectives on Industrial Society. Boston: Little Brown.

Glazer, Nathan and Daniel P. Moynihan
1963 Beyond the Melting Pot. Cambridge, Massachusetts; M.I.T. Press

Gordon, Milton M.
1964 Assimilation in American Life. New York: Oxford University Press.

1978 Human Nature, Class, and Ethnicity. New York: Oxford University Press.

Greeley, Andrew M. and William C. McCready
1974 Ethnicity in the United States: A Preliminary Reconnaissance. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Gupta, Santosh P.
1975 "Changes in the Food Habits of Asian Indians in the United States: A Case Study". Sociology and Social Research, 60: 87-99.

Hollander, P.
1973 Soviet and American Society: A Comparison. New York: Oxford University Press.

Inkeles, Alex and Peter H. Rossi
1956 "National Comparisons of Occupational Prestige" American Journal of Sociology, 61: 329-229

Kitano, Harry
1969 Japanese Americans. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Lambert, Richard D. and Marvin Bressler
1956 Indian Students on an American Campus. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Lyman, Standord M.
1972 The Black American in Sociological Thought: A Failure of Perspective. New York: Capricorn Books.

Mason, Philip.
1970 Patterns of Dominance. New York: Oxford University Press.

Meyer, John W., John Boli-Bennett, and Christopher Chase-Dunn
1975 Convergence and Divergence in Development in Alex Inkeles, ed., Annual Review of Sociology, Vol. 1, Palo Alto, CA: Annual Review, Inc.

Metzger, L. Paul.
1976 "American Sociology and Black Assimilation: Conflicting Perspectives", American Journal of Sociology, 4: 643-644.

Nie, Norman, C. Hadlai Hull, Jean G. Jenkins, Karen Steinbrenner, and Dale H. Bent.
1975 Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, 2nd ed., New York: McGraw-Hill.

Rex, John.
1973 Race, Colonialism and the City. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Turner, Jonathan H., and Royce Singleton, Jr.
1978 "A Theory of Ethnic Oppression: Toward a Reintegration of Cultural and Structual Concepts in Ethnic Relations Theory." Social Forces, 56: 1001-1018.

Tyler, Stephen A.
1973 India: An Anthropological Perspective. Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear.

U. S. Bureau of the Census.
1973 Census of Population: 1970 Detailed Characteristics of the Population, Part 1, United States Summary, Section 2. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

1972 Census of Population: 1970 Detailed Characteristics Final Reports PC(1)-D45, Texas Section. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing office

Useem, John and Ruth Useem.
1955 The Western-Educated Man in India. New York: Dryden Press.

Watson, James L., ed.
1977 Between Two Cultures: Migrants and Minorities in Britain. Oxford: Blackwell.

Welty, Paul Thomas.
1976 The Asians: Their Heritage and Their Destiny, 5th ed., Philadelphia: Lippincott.